



EASTERN SIERRA CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) MEETING

April 8, 2024, 1:00-2:30 PM

Inyo County Health and Human Services

Zoom: **Join on your computer** <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83070482119>

Meeting ID: **830 7048 2119** Passcode: **547199** Call in: +1-669-444-9171

AGENDA

Public Notice: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Inyo County HHS (760) 873-3305. Notification 24 hours prior to the meeting will enable Agency staff to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

1.0 Call Meeting to Order and Introductions

Members: Anna Scott, Amanda Greenberg, Jennifer Kreitz, Kris Kuntz,

Patricia Robertson

Absent: Eryn Dobyns,

Other: Danielle Murray, Rebecca Samaha, Tianna Arbulu, Amy Wyatt, Sara Alden, Francie Avitia, Isaura Ocampo, Vanessa Inyo County, Morningstar Willis- Wagoner, Nirmala Devi Kumar, Kara Reno VA, Erin Rubin CILS

Ms. Scott advised that the format of the agenda will be changing- looking for simplification. The agenda will have less detail.

2.0 Public Comment

None

3.0 Approval of Minutes

Ms. Scott made motion to approve and was seconded by Ms. Greenberg

Ayes: Ms. Scott, Ms. Greenberg, Ms. Kreitz, Mr. Kuntz, Ms. Robertson

Nayes: -0-

Absent: Ms. Dobyns

4.0 CoC Referral Protocol

Ms. Robertson states we are in the early stages of leasing out Innsbruck lodge for clients in coordinated entry system. Beneficial to adopt a referral protocol for all participant orgs. The document is a basic overview of ESCoC and how housing placement takes place through CoC. The process is in partnership with Coordinated Entry P&P's. At the end of the document there is a referral form- happy to receive feedback. Signature at the end- specifically for placement at Innsbruck. Would like

the board to approve the process.

Ms. Greenberg asks for workflow. Ms. Robertson references flowchart. See flowchart attached to agenda for process. Do need to process referrals with the highest need first, there is an internal process under step 3 where ESCH staff will analyze the referral. If there are any issues a notification will be sent to the organization. If referral is accepted there is an application process to make sure they income qualify (below 80% of median income in the area).

Ms. Avitia asks if there is already a known client that has been in coordinated entry and has been evaluated in HIMS do they need a referral?

Ms. Robertson says yes, they will need referral forms but ESCH will work with housing navigators to appropriately fill in referral to reference the client is an existing one.

Ms. Scott says this process will serve future processes outside of Innsbruck (and outside of housing projects).

Ms. Robertson agrees this could be used in the future and states ESCH wanted to clearly separate their role as a participant vs ESCH and are doing so on the form.

Ms. Greenberg states that there are a few ways that the referral form could be clearer in some areas. She offers to review with stakeholders to provide feedback.

Mr. Kuntz states this feels like a good temporary step- as someone walks into some sort of access to coordinated entry a needs assessment is done and then the CoC manages the coordinated entry queue.

Ms. Robertson states this makes sense and for ESCH this is a way to help separate roles of ESCH because they are involved in different ways.

Mr. Kuntz reiterates it is a good temporary solution.

Meeting participants then discuss various processes in other counties.

Ms. Robertson states that in some ways this process memorializes casual conversations. Setting up systems for the future- whether they change or evolve over time is going to benefit us all in the long run. As we have staff turnover the process will be useful.

Further discussion about who completes the referral form and the small number of individuals that will be impacted by its implementation.

Ms. Robertson states we can approve today and bring a revised version next time.

Ms. Kreitz made motion to approve with the knowledge that non-substantial clarifying amendments are acceptable seconded by Ms. Greenberg

Ayes: Ms. Scott, Ms. Greenberg, Ms. Kreitz, Mr. Kuntz, Ms. Robertson

Nayes: -0-

Absent: Ms. Dobyns

5.0 HHAP 1 and 2 Budget Amendment

Ms. Scott- we have received final accounting of funds for HHAP 1 and 2. Back in May of 2023, board adopted proposed expenditure plan for funds. See tables below for categories and proposed expenditure. CoC board has provided letters indicating funding for Access Apartments is set aside, have also set aside specific amount for Innsbruck lodge.

Since then, there have been changes to the allocation plan – the updated version includes an additional \$494,267 from sale of Navigation Center- this is final reconciliation of HHAP funding stream.

HHAP 2 has remaining \$324,093. It is lower because there were additional expenditures IMACA was able to claim. HHAP 1 needs to be spent by June 30, 2025, HHAP 2 needs to be spent by June 30, 2026- just over \$800,000.

The youth set aside has stayed about the same, replacement reserve has remained the same, operating subsidies for Valley Apartments remains the same, subcommittee suggested additional remaining funds goes into delivery of permanent housing (Innsbruck Lodge). Given updated information we are asking CoC to approve the updated expenditure plan.

Funds for HHAP 1 and 2 have not been transferred- the contract is with the state but given we have deadlines we can take funds from HHAP 3 and 4. Confident we will get funds before the deadline. Risk= if we were to expend funds before they were transferred, we would have to rework HHAP 3 and 4 expenditures. \$343,338- costs associated with Innsbruck. \$15,000 for Valley and \$15,000 for Access apts.

Ms. Kreitz- have about \$30,000 to use towards a project, confident we can spend money before the deadline.

Ms. Scott- how do we allow other agencies to come in and ask for funds? Looking to memorialize that in governance documents to open a process. Administrative costs are going towards Thurmond Consulting Contract.

Ms. Kreitz made motion to approve seconded by Ms. Greenberg

Ayes: Ms. Scott, Ms. Greenberg, Ms. Kreitz, Mr. Kuntz, Ms. Robertson

Nayes: -0-

Absent: Ms. Dobyns

6.0 HHAP 3 Obligation

Ms. Scott states there is an allocation for Inyo, Mono, and CoC. Looking at how funds should be used now. Must obligate a portion before May.

Ms. Wyatt reached out to CalICH to notify them that we need more time. Ms. Wyatt states that the lead applicant was the CoC- the good news is we only have to obligate 50% of funds by the end of May. If we can't, we would have to submit a disbursement plan or a plan of how we will allocate funding through December 2024. Due June 2024.

Ms. Scott- We do not anticipate being at the place where we can obligate those funds by May, would need to come up with plan by end of June. Obligated HHAP 1 and 2 by CoC board order and following up with contract.

7.0 HHAP 5 Application

Ms. Wyatt states the application was submitted in March, CalICH has 60 days to review and come up with any amendments needed. The outcome is to improve data quality. The only news is that we are waiting. If revision is needed, we will get 3-4 weeks to complete changes. In the next 4 months we can expect to have an agreement between Inyo County and the state.

Ms. Scott- last month we discussed that we need an MOU between Mono, Inyo and CoC- this is fully filed.

8.0 Roundtable

Ms. Arbulu states she will be out on leave, but a new Health Net representative will be attending.

9.0 Future Agenda Items

1. Governance Charter Workgroup
2. HMIS/CES Update
3. Quarterly fiscal report for HHAP, HHIP and CA Planning Grant expenditures
4. Update on ESCoC Board Vacancies – pending updated Governance Charter

10.0 Next meeting – May 13, 2024 1:00-2:30

11.0 Adjournment

Allocation of remaining HHAP 1 and 2 balance

V3-5/8/23

APPROVED 5/8/23

	HHAP 1	HHAP 2	Total
Original Allocation	\$733,546.24	\$356,764.00	\$1,090,310
Expended:	\$593,518.47	\$1,563.32	\$595,082
Remaining	\$140,027.77	\$355,200.68	\$495,228.45

Activity	Category	HHAP 1	HHAP 2	TOTAL
Admin costs (7% of remaining balance):	Administrative	-9801.94	-24864.05	-\$34,665.99
Youth set-aside (8% of original allocations)	Interim Sheltering	-58683.83	-28540.63	-\$87,224.46
Replacement Reserve for Access Apartments	Delivery of Permanent Housing	-15000.00	0.00	-\$15,000.00
Construction cost overruns on Silver Peaks and Innsbruck and Access Apartments	Delivery of Permanent Housing	-41542.00	-301796.00	-\$343,338.00
Additional Operating Reserve for Valley Apartments	Operating Subsidies	-15000.00	0.00	-\$15,000.00

(\$0.00) \$0.00 \$0.00

Proposed Allocation of remaining HHAP 1 and 2 balance

 Exp Deadline
Exp Deadline

V4-4/2/24 6/30/25 6/30/26

	HHAP 1 (A02)	HHAP 2 (A02)	Total
Original Allocation	\$733,546.24	\$356,764.00	\$1,090,310
Expended:	\$239,279.06	\$32,670.97	\$271,950
Remaining	\$494,267.18	\$324,093.03	\$818,360.21

Activity	Category	HHAP 1	HHAP 2	TOTAL
Admin costs (7% of remaining balance):	Administrative	-34598.70	-22686.51	-\$57,285.21
Youth set-aside (8% of original allocations)	Rapid Rehousing, Services Coordination, Street outreach	-58683.70	-28541.12	-\$87,224.82
Replacement Reserve for Access Apartments	Delivery of Permanent Housing	-15000.00	0.00	-\$15,000.00
Construction cost overruns on Silver Peaks and Innsbruck and Access Apartments	Delivery of Permanent Housing	-370984.78	-272865.40	-\$643,850.18
Additional Operating Reserve for Valley Apartments	Operating Subsidies	-15000.00	0.00	-\$15,000.00

(\$0.00) (\$0.00) \$0.00